

Privacy-loss Budget Allocation 2023-04-03  
Demographic and Housing Characteristics File  
Person Tables (Production Settings)  
United States

Global $\rho$	4.96
Global epsilon*	26.34
$\delta$	$10^{-10}$

\*When converting  $\rho$ -based privacy-loss budgets to  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  equivalents, we are selecting a single point along the continuum of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  pairs. Analysis of the privacy protection afforded by a  $\rho$  budget should use the entire continuum, not a single  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  point. Some formulas provide tighter bounds on the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  curve implied by a particular value of  $\rho$ . We have used this one:

$$\epsilon = \rho + 2 * \sqrt{-\rho * \log_e \delta}$$

Source: Bun, M., & Steinke, T. (2016, November). Concentrated differential privacy: Simplifications, extensions, and lower bounds. In Theory of Cryptography Conference (pp. 635-658). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

	$\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level
US	1.91%
State	26.17%
County	10.00%
Population Estimates Primitive Geography <sup>†</sup>	12.52%
Tract Subset Group <sup>‡</sup>	12.52%
Tract Subset <sup>‡</sup>	27.99%
Optimized Block Group <sup>°</sup>	8.67%
Block	0.22%

Query	Per Query $\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level							
	US	State	County	Population Estimates Primitive Geography <sup>†</sup>	Tract Subset Group <sup>‡</sup>	Tract Subset <sup>‡</sup>	Optimized Block Group <sup>°</sup>	Block
AGE_18_64_116 * RELGQ_4_GROUPS	0.15%	2.01%	0.62%	0.96%	0.96%	1.75%	0.87%	0.02%
AGE_18_64_116 * SEX	0.15%	2.01%	0.62%	0.96%	0.96%	1.75%	0.87%	0.02%
AGE_38_GROUPS * SEX	0.15%	2.01%	0.62%	0.96%	0.96%	1.75%	0.87%	0.02%
HISPANIC * SEX	0.15%	2.01%	0.62%	0.96%	0.96%	1.75%	0.87%	0.02%
SEX * RELGQ_4_GROUPS	0.15%	2.01%	0.62%	0.96%	0.96%	1.75%	0.87%	0.02%
GQ_CONSTR_GROUPS * AGE_10_GROUPS	0.59%	8.05%	2.50%	3.85%	3.85%	7.00%	0.87%	0.02%
POPSEHSDTARGETSRELSHIP	0.15%	2.01%	2.50%	0.96%	0.96%	7.00%	0.87%	0.02%
HISPANIC * SEX * AGE_40_GROUPS * RELSHIP_AND_EIGHT_LEVEL_GQ * CENRACE	0.15%	2.01%	0.62%	0.96%	0.96%	1.75%	0.87%	0.02%
RELGQ * AGE_40_GROUPS * HISPANIC * CENRACE * SEX	0.15%	2.01%	0.62%	0.96%	0.96%	1.75%	0.87%	0.02%
DETAILED	0.15%	2.01%	0.62%	0.96%	0.96%	1.75%	0.87%	0.02%

<sup>†</sup>Population Estimates Primitive Geographies are the most granular geographic unit used by the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program. These geographic units are the most granular geographic areas that are required in order to derive tables for every geography for which official population estimates are produced.

<sup>‡</sup>Tract Subsets are defined as the intersection of Population Estimates Primitive Geographies with census tabulation tracts. Tract Subset Groups are defined as the union of multiple tract subsets that are all within the same Population Estimates primitive geography.

<sup>°</sup>Optimized Block Groups are defined as sequentially grouped blocks within the same Tract Subset in the order of the geoid until either there are no more blocks within the Tract Subset left or there are  $\sqrt{\text{number\_of\_blocks\_in\_tract\_subset}} + 13$  blocks in the block group.

Per Attribute Rho (Persons Tables)		
	RELGQ	3.87
	SEX	2.55
	AGE	3.51
	HISPANIC	1.46
	CENRACE	1.09

Privacy-loss Budget Allocation 2023-04-03  
Demographic and Housing Characteristics File  
Units Tables (Production Settings)  
United States

Global $\rho$	7.70
Global $\epsilon$	34.33
$\delta$	$10^{-10}$

\*When converting  $\rho$ -based privacy-loss budgets to  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  equivalents, we are selecting a single point along the continuum of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  pairs. Analysis of the privacy protection afforded by a  $\rho$  budget should use the entire continuum, not a single  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  point. Some formulas provide tighter bounds on the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  curve implied by a particular value of  $\rho$ . We have used this one:

$$\epsilon = \rho + 2 * \sqrt{-\rho * \log_e \delta}$$

Source: Bun, M., & Steinke, T. (2016, November). Concentrated differential privacy: Simplifications, extensions, and lower bounds. In Theory of Cryptography Conference (pp. 635-658). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

	$\rho$ Allocation by
US	6.28%
State	22.09%
County	18.77%
Population Estimates Primitive Geography <sup>†</sup>	12.61%
Tract Subset Group <sup>‡</sup>	12.61%
Tract Subset <sup>‡</sup>	21.90%
Optimized Block Group <sup>°</sup>	5.53%
Block	0.21%

Query	Per Query $\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level							
	US	State	County	Population Estimates Primitive Geography <sup>†</sup>	Tract Subset Group <sup>‡</sup>	Tract Subset <sup>‡</sup>	Optimized Block Group <sup>°</sup>	Block
MULTIG * HISP * HHTENSHORT_2LEV	1.03%	0.93%	1.28%	1.26%	1.26%	1.49%	0.38%	0.01%
HISP * HHTENSHORT_2LEV	0.28%	0.25%	0.35%	0.28%	0.28%	0.40%	0.10%	0.00%
HISP * HHTENSHORT_2LEV * RACE	0.28%	0.25%	1.95%	1.95%	1.95%	2.27%	0.57%	0.02%
PARTNER_TYPE_DETAILED_OWN_CHILD_STATUS * SEX * HHTENSHORT_2LEV	1.03%	1.85%	2.56%	2.53%	2.53%	2.99%	0.75%	0.03%
COUPLED_HH_TYPE * HISP * HHTENSHORT_2LEV	1.03%	0.93%	5.12%	1.26%	1.26%	5.97%	1.51%	0.06%
SEX * HISP * HHTENSHORT_3LEV * RACE * DETAILEDCOUPLETYPMULTGENDETOWNCHILDSIZE	0.33%	4.18%	1.79%	1.26%	1.26%	2.09%	0.53%	0.02%
SEX * HISP * HHTENSHORT_3LEV * RACE * HHAGE * DETAILEDCOUPLETYPMULTGENDETOWNCHILDSIZE	0.33%	4.18%	1.79%	1.26%	1.26%	2.09%	0.53%	0.02%
HHTENSHORT_3LEV * HHAGE * DETAILEDCOUPLETYPMULTGENDETOWNCHILDSIZE	0.28%	0.25%	0.35%	0.28%	0.28%	0.40%	0.10%	0.00%
DETAILED	1.36%	5.10%	1.79%	1.26%	1.26%	2.09%	0.53%	0.02%
TENVACGQ	0.34%	4.18%	1.79%	1.26%	1.26%	2.09%	0.53%	0.02%

<sup>†</sup>Population Estimates Primitive Geographies are the most granular geographic unit used by the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program. These geographic units are the most granular geographic areas that are required in order to derive tables for every geography for which official population estimates are produced.

<sup>‡</sup>Tract Subsets are defined as the intersection of Population Estimates Primitive Geographies with census tabulation tracts. Tract Subset Groups are defined as the union of multiple tract subsets that are all within the same Population Estimates primitive geography.

<sup>°</sup>Optimized Block Groups are defined as sequentially grouped blocks within the same Tract Subset in the order of the geoid until either there are no more blocks within the Tract Subset left or there are  $\sqrt{\text{number\_of\_blocks\_in\_tract\_subset}} + 13$  blocks in the block group.

Per Attribute Rho (Units Tables)		
	SEX	3.9
	HHAGE	2.07
	HISP	5.57
	RACE	3.51
	ELDERLY	1.03
	HHTENSHORT_3LEV	6.82
	HHTYPE_DHCH	5.96
	TENVACGQ	0.88

Privacy-loss Budget Allocation 2023-04-03  
 Production Settings  
 United States

Cross-Universe (Persons+Units), Cross-Product (P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data and DHC), By-Geolevel Rho		
	Block within Optimized* Block Group	0.14
	Block within County	8.53
	Block within State	10.75
	Block within US	14.65

Cross-Universe (Persons+Units), Cross-Product (P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data and DHC), Global Privacy-loss Budget		
	Global <i>rho</i>	15.29
	Global <i>epsilon</i> **	52.83
	<i>delta</i>	10 <sup>-10</sup>

*\*The optimized block group definitions used in the TopDown Algorithm in the production runs for the data products above are not identical to one another. The "Block in Optimized Block Group" entry in this table should therefore be interpreted as the cross-product privacy-loss budget allocation for blocks within the intersection of the definition of optimized block groups that were used in each of these runs.*

*\*\*When converting  $\rho$ -based privacy-loss budgets to  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  equivalents, we are selecting a single point along the continuum of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  pairs. Analysis of the privacy protection afforded by a  $\rho$  budget should use the entire continuum, not a single  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  point. Some formulas provide tighter bounds on the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  curve implied by a particular value of  $\rho$ . We have used this one:*

$$\epsilon = \rho + 2 * \sqrt{-\rho * \log_e \delta}$$

Source: Bun, M., & Steinke, T. (2016, November). Concentrated differential privacy: Simplifications, extensions, and lower bounds. In Theory of Cryptography Conference (pp. 635-658). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Privacy-loss Budget Allocation 2023-04-03  
Demographic and Housing Characteristics File  
Person Tables (Production Settings)  
Puerto Rico

Global $\rho$	4.96
Global $\epsilon$	26.34
$\delta$	$10^{-10}$

\*When converting  $\rho$ -based privacy-loss budgets to  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  equivalents, we are selecting a single point along the continuum of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  pairs. Analysis of the privacy protection afforded by a  $\rho$  budget should use the entire continuum, not a single  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  point. Some formulas provide tighter bounds on the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  curve implied by a particular value of  $\rho$ . We have used this one:

$$\epsilon = \rho + 2 * \sqrt{-\rho * \log_e \delta}$$

Source: Bun, M., & Steinke, T. (2016, November). Concentrated differential privacy: Simplifications, extensions, and lower bounds. In Theory of Cryptography Conference (pp. 635-658). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

	$\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level
PR	26.48%
Municipio	10.32%
Population Estimates Primitive Geography <sup>†</sup>	12.84%
Tract Subset Group <sup>‡</sup>	12.84%
Tract Subset <sup>‡</sup>	28.31%
Optimized Block Group <sup>°</sup>	8.99%
Block	0.22%

Query	Per Query $\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level						
	PR	Municipio	Population Estimates Primitive Geography <sup>†</sup>	Tract Subset Group <sup>‡</sup>	Tract Subset <sup>‡</sup>	Optimized Block Group <sup>°</sup>	Block
AGE_18_64_116 * RELGQ_4_GROUPS	2.03%	0.64%	0.99%	0.99%	1.77%	0.90%	0.02%
AGE_18_64_116 * SEX	2.04%	0.64%	0.99%	0.99%	1.77%	0.90%	0.02%
AGE_38_GROUPS * SEX	2.04%	0.64%	0.99%	0.99%	1.77%	0.90%	0.02%
HISPANIC * SEX	2.04%	0.64%	0.99%	0.99%	1.77%	0.90%	0.02%
SEX * RELGQ_4_GROUPS	2.04%	0.64%	0.99%	0.99%	1.77%	0.90%	0.02%
GQ_CONSTR_GROUPS *							
AGE_10_GROUPS	8.15%	2.58%	3.95%	3.95%	7.08%	0.90%	0.02%
POPSEHSDTARGETSRELSHIP	2.04%	2.58%	0.99%	0.99%	7.08%	0.90%	0.02%
HISPANIC * SEX * AGE_40_GROUPS *							
RELSHIP_AND_EIGHT_LEVEL_GQ *							
CENRACE	2.04%	0.64%	0.99%	0.99%	1.77%	0.90%	0.02%
RELGQ * AGE_40_GROUPS * HISPANIC *							
CENRACE * SEX	2.04%	0.64%	0.99%	0.99%	1.77%	0.90%	0.02%
DETAILED	2.04%	0.64%	0.99%	0.99%	1.77%	0.90%	0.02%

<sup>†</sup>Population Estimates Primitive Geographies are the most granular geographic unit used by the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program. These geographic units are the most granular geographic areas that are required in order to derive tables for every geography for which official population estimates are produced.

<sup>‡</sup>Tract Subsets are defined as the intersection of Population Estimates Primitive Geographies with census tabulation tracts. Tract Subset Groups are defined as the union of multiple tract subsets that are all within the same Population Estimates primitive geography.

<sup>°</sup>Optimized Block Groups are defined as sequentially grouped blocks within the same Tract Subset in the order of the geoid until either there are no more blocks within the Tract Subset left or there are  $\text{sqrt}(\text{number\_of\_blocks\_in\_tract\_subset}) + 13$  blocks in the block group.

Per Attribute Rho (Persons Tables)		
	RELGQ	3.87
	SEX	2.55
	AGE	3.51
	HISPANIC	1.46
	CENRACE	1.09

**Privacy-loss Budget Allocation 2023-04-03**  
**Demographic and Housing Characteristics File**  
**Units Tables (Production Settings)**  
**Puerto Rico**

Global $\rho$	7.70
Global $\epsilon$	34.33
$\delta$	$10^{-10}$

\*When converting  $p$ -based privacy-loss budgets to  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  equivalents, we are selecting a single point along the continuum of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  pairs. Analysis of the privacy protection afforded by a  $p$  budget should use the entire continuum, not a single  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  point. Some formulas provide tighter bounds on the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  curve implied by a particular value of  $p$ . We have used this one:

$$\epsilon = \rho + 2 * \sqrt{-\rho * \log_e \delta}$$

Source: Bun, M., & Steinke, T. (2016, November). Concentrated differential privacy: Simplifications, extensions, and lower bounds. In Theory of Cryptography Conference (pp. 635-658). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

	$\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level
PR	23.13%
Municipio	19.82%
Population Estimates Primitive Geography <sup>†</sup>	13.66%
Tract Subset Group <sup>‡</sup>	13.66%
Tract Subset <sup>‡</sup>	22.94%
Optimized Block Group <sup>°</sup>	6.58%
Block	0.21%

Query	Per Query $\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level						
	PR	Municipio	Population Estimates Primitive Geography <sup>†</sup>	Tract Subset Group <sup>‡</sup>	Tract Subset <sup>‡</sup>	Optimized Block Group <sup>°</sup>	Block
MULTIG * HISP * HHTENSHORT_2LEV	0.97%	1.35%	1.37%	1.37%	1.56%	0.45%	0.01%
HISP * HHTENSHORT_2LEV	0.26%	0.36%	0.30%	0.30%	0.42%	0.12%	0.00%
HISP * HHTENSHORT_2LEV * RACE	0.26%	2.06%	2.11%	2.11%	2.38%	0.68%	0.02%
PARTNER_TYPE_DETAILED_OWN_CHILD_STATUS * SEX * HHTENSHORT_2LEV	1.94%	2.70%	2.74%	2.74%	3.13%	0.90%	0.03%
COUPLED_HH_TYPE * HISP * HHTENSHORT_2LEV	0.97%	5.41%	1.37%	1.37%	6.26%	1.79%	0.06%
SEX * HISP * HHTENSHORT_3LEV * RACE * DETAILEDCOUPLETYPEMULTGENDETOWNCHILDSIZE	4.37%	1.89%	1.37%	1.37%	2.19%	0.63%	0.02%
SEX * HISP * HHTENSHORT_3LEV * RACE * HHAGE * DETAILEDCOUPLETYPEMULTGENDETOWNCHILDSIZE	4.37%	1.89%	1.37%	1.37%	2.19%	0.63%	0.02%
HHTENSHORT_3LEV * HHAGE * DETAILEDCOUPLETYPEMULTGENDETOWNCHILDSIZE	0.26%	0.36%	0.30%	0.30%	0.42%	0.12%	0.00%
DETAILED	5.35%	1.89%	1.37%	1.37%	2.19%	0.63%	0.02%
TENVACGQ	4.37%	1.89%	1.37%	1.37%	2.19%	0.63%	0.02%

<sup>†</sup>Population Estimates Primitive Geographies are the most granular geographic unit used by the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program. These geographic units are the most granular geographic areas that are required in order to derive tables for every geography for which official population estimates are produced.

<sup>‡</sup>Tract Subsets are defined as the intersection of Population Estimates Primitive Geographies with census tabulation tracts. Tract Subset Groups are defined as the union of multiple tract subsets that are all within the same Population Estimates primitive geography.

<sup>°</sup>Optimized Block Groups are defined as sequentially grouped blocks within the same Tract Subset in the order of the geoid until either there are no more blocks within the Tract Subset left or there are  $\sqrt{\text{number\_of\_blocks\_in\_tract\_subset}} + 13$  blocks in the block group.

Per Attribute Rho (Units Tables)		
	SEX	3.90
	HHAGE	2.04
	HISP	5.56
	RACE	3.55
	ELDERLY	0.99
	HHTENSHORT_3LEV	6.79
	HHTYPE_DHCH	5.91
	TENVACGQ	0.91

Privacy-loss Budget Allocation 2023-04-03  
 Production Settings  
 Puerto Rico

Cross-Universe (Persons+Units), Cross-Product (P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data and DHC), By-Geolevel Rho		
	Block within Optimized* Block Group	0.14
	Block within Municipio	9.29
	Block within PR	11.77

Cross-Universe (Persons+Units), Cross-Product (P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data and DHC), Global Privacy-loss Budget		
	Global <i>rho</i>	15.29
	Global <i>epsilon</i> **	52.83
	<i>delta</i>	10 <sup>-10</sup>

*\*The optimized block group definitions used in the TopDown Algorithm in the production runs for the data products above are not identical to one another. The "Block in Optimized Block Group" entry in this table should therefore be interpreted as the cross-product privacy-loss budget allocation for blocks within the intersection of the definition of optimized block groups that were used in each of these runs.*

*\*\*When converting  $\rho$ -based privacy-loss budgets to  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  equivalents, we are selecting a single point along the continuum of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  pairs. Analysis of the privacy protection afforded by a  $\rho$  budget should use the entire continuum, not a single  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  point. Some formulas provide tighter bounds on the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  curve implied by a particular value of  $\rho$ . We have used this one:*

$$\epsilon = \rho + 2 * \sqrt{-\rho * \log_e \delta}$$

Source: Bun, M., & Steinke, T. (2016, November). Concentrated differential privacy: Simplifications, extensions, and lower bounds. In Theory of Cryptography Conference (pp. 635-658). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Privacy-loss Budget Allocation 2023-04-03  
 Redistricting (P.L. 94-171) Data  
 Person Tables (Production Settings)  
 United States

Global $\rho$	2.56
Global $\epsilon$	17.90
$\delta$	$10^{-10}$

	$\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level
US	2.54%
State	35.13%
County	10.91%
Tract	16.76%
Optimized Block Group*	30.64%
Block	4.03%

Query	Per Query $\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level					
	US	State	County	Tract	Optimized Block Group*	Block
TOTAL (1 cell)		32.35%	8.32%	6.40%	12.75%	0.00%
CENRACE (63 cells)	0.03%	0.05%	0.03%	0.03%	0.02%	0.01%
HISPANIC (2 cells)	0.02%	0.05%	0.03%	0.02%	0.02%	0.00%
VOTINGAGE (2 cells)	0.02%	0.05%	0.03%	0.02%	0.02%	0.00%
HHINSTLEVELS (3 cells)	0.02%	0.05%	0.03%	0.02%	0.02%	0.00%
HHGQ (8 cells)	0.02%	0.05%	0.03%	0.02%	0.02%	0.00%
HISPANIC*CENRACE (126 cells)	0.08%	0.10%	0.07%	7.90%	7.89%	0.02%
VOTINGAGE*CENRACE (126 cells)	0.08%	0.10%	0.07%	0.08%	0.07%	0.02%
VOTINGAGE*HISPANIC (4 cells)	0.02%	0.05%	0.03%	0.02%	0.02%	0.00%
VOTINGAGE*HISPANIC*CENRACE (252 cells)	0.27%	0.29%	0.27%	0.27%	0.18%	0.07%
HHGQ*VOTINGAGE*						
HISPANIC*CENRACE (2,016 cells)	1.99%	1.97%	2.01%	1.97%	9.63%	3.88%

\*The Optimized Block Groups used within the TopDown Algorithm differ from tabulation block groups. These differences improve accuracy for "off-spine" geographies like places and minor civil divisions. The use of optimized block groups for measurement and post-processing within the TopDown Algorithm does not impact how the resulting data will be tabulated. All Census data products will be tabulated using the official tabulation block groups as defined by the Census Bureau's Geography Division.

\*\*The TOTAL query (total population) is held invariant at the state level. This  $\rho$  allocation assigned to TOTAL at the state level is the amount assigned to the state-level queries for the total population of all American Indian and Alaska Native (AIAN) tribal areas within the state and for the total population of the remainder of the state, for the 36 states that include AIAN tribal areas.

Privacy-loss Budget Allocation 2023-04-03  
 Redistricting (P.L. 94-171) Data  
 Units Tables (Production Settings)  
 United States

Global <i>rho</i>	0.07
Global <i>epsilon</i>	2.70
<i>delta</i>	$10^{-10}$

	<i>rho</i> Allocation by Geographic Level
US	0.49%
State	0.49%
County	8.54%
Tract	35.51%
Optimized Block Group*	42.90%
Block	12.07%

Query	Per Query <i>rho</i> Allocation by Geographic Level					
	US	State	County	Tract	Optimized Block Group*	Block
Detail (2 cells)	0.49%	0.49%	8.54%	35.51%	42.90%	12.07%

*\*The Optimized Block Groups used within the TopDown Algorithm differ from tabulation block groups. These differences improve accuracy for "off-spine" geographies like places and minor civil divisions. The use of optimized block groups for measurement and post-processing within the TopDown Algorithm does not impact how the resulting data will be tabulated. All Census data products will be tabulated using the official tabulation block groups as defined by the Census Bureau's Geography Division.*



Privacy-loss Budget Allocation 2023-04-03  
 Redistricting (P.L. 94-171) Data  
 Person Tables (Production Settings)  
 Puerto Rico

Global $\rho$	2.56
Global $\epsilon$	17.90
$\delta$	$10^{-10}$

	$\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level
PR	16.81%
Municipio	16.96%
Tract	18.83%
Optimized Block Group*	43.38%
Block	4.03%

Query	Per Query $\rho$ Allocation by Geographic Level				
	PR	Municipio	Tract	Optimized Block Group*	Block
TOTAL (1 cell)		12.94%	6.74%	19.83%	0.00%
CENRACE (63 cells)	1.71%	0.04%	0.06%	0.04%	0.01%
HISPANIC (2 cells)	1.71%	0.04%	0.03%	0.04%	0.00%
VOTINGAGE (2 cells)	1.71%	0.04%	0.03%	0.04%	0.00%
HHINSTLEVELS (3 cells)	1.71%	0.04%	0.03%	0.04%	0.00%
HHGQ (8 cells)	1.71%	0.04%	0.03%	0.04%	0.00%
HISPANIC*CENRACE (126 cells)	1.74%	0.12%	7.95%	7.92%	0.02%
VOTINGAGE*CENRACE (126 cells)	1.74%	0.12%	0.14%	0.11%	0.02%
VOTINGAGE*HISPANIC (4 cells)	1.71%	0.04%	0.03%	0.04%	0.00%
VOTINGAGE*HISPANIC*CENRACE (252 cells)	1.83%	0.42%	0.46%	0.29%	0.07%
HHGQ*VOTINGAGE*					
HISPANIC*CENRACE (2,016 cells)	1.23%	3.12%	3.33%	14.98%	3.88%

*\*The Optimized Block Groups used within the TopDown Algorithm differ from tabulation block groups. These differences improve accuracy for "off-spine" geographies like places and minor civil divisions. The use of optimized block groups for measurement and post-processing within the TopDown Algorithm does not impact how the resulting data will be tabulated. All Census data products will be tabulated using the official tabulation block groups as defined by the Census Bureau's Geography Division.*

Privacy-loss Budget Allocation 2023-04-03  
 Redistricting (P.L. 94-171) Data  
 Units Tables (Production Settings)  
 Puerto Rico

Global <i>rho</i>	0.07
Global <i>epsilon</i>	2.70
<i>delta</i>	$10^{-10}$

	<i>rho</i> Allocation by Geographic Level
PR	0.58%
Municipio	8.55%
Tract	35.92%
Optimized Block Group*	42.88%
Block	12.07%

Query	Per Query <i>rho</i> Allocation by Geographic Level				
	PR	Municipio	Tract	Optimized Block Group*	Block
Detail (2 cells)	0.58%	8.55%	35.92%	42.88%	12.07%

*\*The Optimized Block Groups used within the TopDown Algorithm differ from tabulation block groups. These differences improve accuracy for "off-spine" geographies like places and minor civil divisions. The use of optimized block groups for measurement and post-processing within the TopDown Algorithm does not impact how the resulting data will be tabulated. All Census data products will be tabulated using the official tabulation block groups as defined by the Census Bureau's Geography Division.*